



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,608	08/15/2001	L. Michael Maritzen	80398.P428	1723
8791	7590	02/03/2004	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			HOLZEN, STEPHEN A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3644		

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,608	MARITZEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen A. Holzen	3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13, 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,6,10.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 14-18 have been cancelled
2. Claims 1-13,19-24 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter (US 5,926,798).

Re - Claims 1, 8 and 19: Carter discloses the claimed computer-implemented method in which at least one intelligent agent negotiates the purchase of a product or a service on behalf of a party (see Col. 2, lines 65-Col. 3, line 30) except for the personal data selected from the group consisting of "historical purchases activity, potential future purchase activity, and a group to which the party is a member. However the above claimed personal data are all well known in the art to be useful in price negotiation. (Sam's Club is one example of the above claimed subject matter). It would have been obvious to reward to purchaser with better prices based on group memberships and

potential future purchase activity. (Note: it should be appreciated that purchasing through an agent is inherently anonymous).

Re - Claims 2, 9, 20: using the agent to reduce a price (see col. 2, lines 67).

Re - Claims 3, 10, 21: It is old and well known in the art that a purchaser must register with an online purchaser before purchasing.

Re - Claim 4, 11, 22: Carter discloses that it is known to perform data mining operation related to the purchase of one of the product and the service. (See Col. 3, lines 1-30)

Re - Claim 5, 12, 23: It is well known in the art that a secure link must be established between a client and server during the transfer of sensitive information (i.e. Credit Card, Contact information)

Re - Claim 7: Carter discloses that it is well known to do a price comparison between two suppliers. (see Col. 3, lines 1-30)

4. Claims 6, 13, 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of "tryllian Mobile Agents: 'Going beyond the Web" (herein referred to as "Tryllian"). Carter discloses every aspect of the present invention except wherein using a transition device to authorize that at least one intelligent agent to complete purchase. Tryllian however teaches that it is well known and old in the art to use a transaction device.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
6. "Tryllian" teaches:
 - use of mobile agents to negotiate price
 - user preferences are entered to the agents
 - the agent negotiates prices based on customer preferences
7. "About Gossip" teaches that it is known to use agents to shop for users.
8. Bigus et al (6,985,178) teaches that it is known for agents to negotiate and reduce prices on behalf of users. This reference may be used to reject the claims as Carter has been used.
9. Rosen (5,878,139) teaches anonymous purchase of goods. +
10. Teper et al (5,815,665): teaches anonymous purchasing using a brokering agent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 703-308-2484. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles T. Jordan can be reached on 703-306-4159. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4174.

Sah

Charles T. Jordan
CHARLES T. JORDAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600